

Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY THE PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING. THE AUDIO CASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.

The TAC held its meeting at the SCAG offices in Downtown Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by Naresh Amatya, SCAG RTP Program Manager.

Members Present

Bhuiyan, Shefa	Caltrans-District 8
Diep, Deborah	CDR/CSU Fullerton
Gabbard, Dana	So. Ca. Transit Advocates
Huddlesston, Lori	LACMTA
Humphrey, Jack	Gateway Cities COG
Mitchell, Miles (Vice-Chair)	LADOT
Mootchnik, David	So. Cal. Commuters Forum
Nord, Gregory	OCTA
Pari, Ian	City of Santa Clarita
Schoetzow, Eileen	LAWA
Schuiling, Ty (Chair)	SANBAG
Shiomoto-Loehr, Gail	Orange County COG
Tsao, Jack	City of Los Angeles
Walecka, Carla	Transportation Corridor Agencies
Cheung, Bob	Katz, Okitsu & Associates
Hamilton, Jeff	City of Glendale
Lee, Frances	Caltrans-District 7

SCAG Staff

Naresh Amatya	
Joe Carreras	
Mark Butala	
His-hwa Hu	
Keith Killough	
Shawn Kuk	
Annie Nam	
Chris Williges	System Metrics (consultant)
Tarek Hatata	System Metrics (consultant)
Bill McCullough	System Metrics (consultant)

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

Naresh Amatya, SCAG, called the meeting to order in place of Chair Doug Kim. Introductions were made.

Motion was made to nominate Ty Schuiling, Chair and Miles Mitchell, Vice Chair. Motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

2.0 Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

3.0 Consent Calendar

3.1 Approval Items

3.1.1 Approve Minutes of November 16, 2006

Members reviewed minutes and recommended the following changes; amend page 12 as follows "SCAG is currently using the old ~~RATM~~ RADM model as an overlay".

Motion was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 RTP Base Year System Gaps/Deficiencies

Bill McCullough, System Metrics presented members with an overview of the preliminary needs assessment on freeway congestion based on the results from SCAG's new transportation model, PeMS and HICOMP data for the PM peak period. For each county, four of the worst congested corridors were identified. Committee members were presented with aerial slide shots that show traffic congestion within these corridors. These needs were identified based on the following performance measures; mobility, accessibility, safety, reliability, productivity, preservation, security, and air quality.

A question was raised as to the availability of data for weekend congestion. Mr. McCullough stated that as more information becomes available the data can be pulled and further analyzed.

An aerial photograph of the I-5SB segment from the 710 to the 605 was presented. PeMS data indicated delays around Washington Blvd. but significant truck traffic around the 605 IC can be observed in the aerial photograph. A TAC member commented that some of the truck traffic can also be found diverting onto the parallel streets perhaps as a way to avoid the congestion. Another comment was made about the presence of the Hobart Intermodal facility located relatively close to the 605 IC.

A question was raised about the AM peak period data. Mr. McCullogh stated that the data is available but has not yet been analyzed. Preliminary analysis focused on PM peak periods was felt to be a good starting point as there is a preponderance of delay during this period relative to others.

The 91 highway corridor through Orange County, as its most congested corridor was discussed next. Mr. McCullough commented that although the analysis being presented was a snapshot of the Orange County 91EB segment, the Riverside 91EB segment was a continuation of the substantial delays through the 91EB corridor in general. Aerial photos of toll road 241 and the 91 managed tolling facility were presented. Mr. Schuiling commented that the 241 to the 91EB merging activity during the PM peak period creates significant congestion in this area. Travelers attempting to benefit from the 241 toll road can generally be observed backed-up all the way to the 91 tolling facility.

The 57NB between the 91 and Los Angeles County line was presented next as the second most congested corridor in OC. Delay around Orangethorpe was pronounced from the collected data. The 91/57 IC and the Diamond Bar/Pathfinder area in LA County also showed significant delays. Again, a larger, regional view would demonstrate that the congestion found on the 57 is not limited to the OC segment of the corridor. In that respect, Mr. McCullough noted that how we define a “corridor” would dictate how we approach analyzing the delay data. Mr. Schuiling noted the bottleneck around the 57/60 IC. The issue seemed to be the way in which drivers attempting to merge to the 60 are required to weave through traffic. There was a question about whether or not the data being presented reflected the ongoing construction activity around the IC. Mr. Hatata responded that the modeling data does not take into account current construction activity. Mr. McCullough added that delays incurred due to construction activity may be reflected in the calibration of the model as actual traffic counts and speed data is considered in the validation process.

I-5SB from the 405 to Alicia Parkway was presented next. The cause for delay in this area seemed clear as there is a drop-off from 6 to 5 lanes near Alicia Parkway. The traffic volume continuing SB past Alicia Parkway was observed as the cause. The 405NB from the 55 and the 22 was also presented. The issue observed here was the simultaneous merging from the 55 and the 71 onto the 405. PeMS data also alludes to bottlenecks on the adjacent surface streets (e.g. Beach Blvd.). A TAC member noted that there is a reduction from 6 to 4 lanes somewhere in the middle of this 405 segment.

From Riverside County, Mr. McCullough presented the 91EB corridor continuing from the Orange County line to I-15 (perhaps extending out to McKinley). Consistent delay is found at McKinley. Data from Caltrans District 8 probe vehicles along with PeMS data all confirm the severe delays at McKinley. The 91 corridor extending EB from OC through Riverside makes up either the most or second most congested in the SCAG region. If you include the congestion found around Van Buren, the 91EB is the most congested. A TAC member commented that the HOV lane ends before Van Buren. Mr. Hatata asked whether there was a proposed extension of the HOV lane for this area. TAC members seemed to agree that there was a proposal to do so.

The 215/60 segment south of the 91 in Riverside, down to the SB/EB split was presented next. PeMS and HICOMP data show significant delays in this area as well, especially around Day St. 215NB the San Bernardino County line was also shown, but again with delays extending well into San Bernardino County.

In San Bernardino County, recent HICOMP data from Caltrans support model results for congestion found along the 1-10EB from the 1-215 to the SR-30, maybe even extending out to the 38. Mr. Schuiling noted that there was a widening project currently under construction eastbound starting at the 30. Mr. Schuiling added that the highway reduces from 12 to 8 lanes just east of the 215 and then down to 6 lanes further east, on the “edge of the map”.

Mr. McCullough presented the I-10 segment EB to I-15 as showing significant delay per model results. Mr. Schuiling commented that the worst congestion on the I-10 can be found from the 15EB. Modeling using 2003 data was noted as an issue in lieu of the fact that the 210 extension to I-15 was completed in 2003. That because of the traffic from the 210EB having to go through the 10 to get to the 215, this segment of the 10 between the 15 and the 215 (Fontana, Rialto, Colton) is currently the most congested in SB County. Mr. Schuiling added that the 210 extension to the 215 should be opening toward the end of this year. And according to modeling work done by SANBAG, the scheduled 210 extension is projected to provide relief for about eight years upon completion.

Next from SB County, the continuation of the 215NB from Riverside County was presented. Again, a regional level assessment of the 215NB corridor extending from Riverside to SB County would probably result in establishing this corridor as a high priority.

Again in SB County, on the 15SB headed toward Riverside County, PeMS picked up significant delay around Jurupa, just before the 60. Mr. Schuiling noted presence of the Ontario-Mira Loma warehousing district nearby. He also stated the district’s relevance with the goods movement traffic from the ports.

Mr. McCullough concluded his presentation by requesting additional feedback from the advisory committee. He welcomed any suggestions or feedback and asked members to consider future conditions. He also stated that the AM model was not carefully analyzed other than taking a quick glance to see if it corresponded with some of the HICOMP and PeMS data that is available. Preservation needs for the various counties and cities would also need to be developed. Data from the transit operators would need to be further assessed as well. Mr. Hatata explained that SCAG would be depending on the counties to provide input/data for arterials, surface streets, and transit as was the practice with previous RTP’s. Productivity and safety data are also on the horizon. The availability of data from loop detection would be a key in assessing productivity. Mr. McCullough noted that SB and Riverside counties have sparse detection and may yield limited data.

A note was made about not including Ventura County in today’s presentations.

TAC member asked if the congestions analysis would be limited to four corridors per county. Mr. McCullough stated that only four areas were chosen based in order to begin the dialogue but it will not be limited to four areas in the final assessment.

Mr. Mootchnik, Southern California Commuters Forum asked if a follow up would be provided to the committee members showing what happens to the sections of road in the 2030 timeframe as well as a comparison between conditions now to conditions in

2030. He also asked if any arterials would be added to the needs assessment in regard to traffic load. Mr. Hatata, System Metrics said that there are a limited number of arterials that are included in the SCAG model but the focus is on highways. However, PeMS and HICOMP data will not be available for cross referencing with modeling results.

Ms. Diep, CDR/CSU Fullerton requested that the presentation be e-mailed to all members in order to circulate it amongst their peers for additional feedback. It was also requested that the presentation be noted that the modeling results were based on 2003 data and also to annotate with current or scheduled construction dates and potential relief impacts for specific segments presented today. Ms. Diep also requested some mention be made of the intent to not limit the system deficiencies analysis to just four corridors for each county. **Ms. Diep also wanted to ensure that the RTP database utilized for modeling be distinct and if there is a separate RHNA database that is developed reflecting any revisions to the socioeconomic assumptions resulting from any appeals or revisions, that that be a separate and distinct database but that the pure RTP database or the pure technical projections be the one that be utilized in the RTP.***

Mr. Amatya, SCAG added that this information is only a starting point in order to continue with the needs analysis. He emphasized the need for a consensus from the stakeholders in terms of identifying the “big ticket” items. Mr. Amatya added that once a Base Line model is in place, the committee can begin looking at what the implementation of the new project scenario will yield in 2035.

Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr, Orange County COG asked if SCAG is independently discussing this item with all of the county transportation commissions (CTC’s) or if this (P&P TAC) was the forum by which the access to and discussion with the CTC’s and their boards is going to be conducted. Mr. Amatya stated that this was the forum for all of the CTC’s and additional conversations would be addressed as needed

Mr. Gabbard, Southern California Transit Advocates suggested that multiple scenarios be addressed i.e. what would happen if congestion pricing was done. Chair Schuiling added that this would address the issue of whether or not the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) has a real performance objective in mind. If so, there are various ways to achieve it and they will cost different amounts of money depending on what the focus is. If the objective is to minimize delay, congestion pricing is a great way to do it and if elected officials buy into that objective then it follows logically that it should be part of the discussion.

Mr. Amatya, SCAG stated that congestion pricing and related financial considerations will be discussed at the RTP workshop planned for elected officials on March 1st which is the day of SCAG’s policy committee meetings. The policy committee meetings will be shortened in order to have an hour-and-a-half long workshop focusing on these transportation finance issues.

Chair Schuiling stated that this item deserved further discussion and the committee agreed to continue the discussion at the next meeting.

* Comments in bold type from Ms. Deborah Diep have been added to the minutes per request made at the 3/15/2007 P&P TAC meeting.

4.2 RTP Base Line Revenue Model

Chris Williges with System Metrics Group provided the committee with an update on the financial forecasting as well as an overview of the financial model. There are two pieces to the financial forecasting; a cost component and a revenue component. Mr. Williges' presentation was focused on the revenue component and included a demonstration of the draft revenue model that is being developed for the RTP update.

On the cost side, staff has sent out requests to each of the county transportation commissions for project data and has received project data from the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and the Long Range Plans. In terms of developing a Base Line, it has been difficult to determine which projects are Base Line projects. Staff is currently sorting through the project cost list and when ready, a comparison to the project revenue model will be done to find out how we stand as a region in terms of cost and revenue.

Mr. Williges stated that the 2004 RTP revenue forecast was in 2002 dollars, with 75% being local funding, and state and federal funding only making up about 25%. Much of this balance has to do with local sales tax measures which make up a good component of the funding within the region. In developing the model, primary funding sources were identified in the region and distinguished between local, state, and federal sources. The following sources were identified:

- Local sources include: Local Sales Tax Measures, Transportation Development Act, Gas Excise Tax Subvention, Farebox Revenue, Highway Tolls, Mitigation Fees, and other local funds.
- State sources include: State Transportation Improvement Program, State Highway Operation & Protection Program, State Gasoline Sales Tax, State Transit Assistance Fund, Proposition 1B, and other state funds.
- Federal sources include: Congestion Mitigation Air Quality, Regional Surface Transportation Program, FTA Formula, FTA Discretionary, and other federal funds.

The primary sources were identified based on the different types of revenue generation mechanisms. These sources were generated by retail sales on all items, sales tax on gasoline, excise tax, or developer fees. Each of the sources will be identified by dollar amounts, county, and year. An example forecast was shown from the slide presentation for one of these revenue sources for each of the years between FY04/05 and FY35/36 which is a 30 year period. The forecasts provided by the county transportation commissions will be used for the forecast. The assumption here is that data provided by the counties are coming from the most appropriate source. However not all counties forecasts for every revenue source are ~~not~~[†] forecasted through the entire RTP period. The model looks at all of the revenue sources together and make sure that the revenue assumptions are consistent across the region and to fill-in data where needed so as to avoid any holes.

[†] The word "not" has been stricken from the minutes per request by Ms. Gail Shiimoto-Lohr at the 3/15/2007 P&P TAC meeting.

System Metrics Group (the consultants) first collected a series of historical data from available published sources thereby establishing the initial parameters based on past experience. Being mindful that past experience may not be an accurate basis for measuring the future, we have set up the revenue model so that some of these basic parameters can be manipulated to reflect the input from TAC. Comments were made about the difficulties of clearly understanding various public revenue mechanisms and their subsequent funding distributions. Another issue has been different publications of the same revenue source for the same year sometimes report different figures.

Our initial forecast based on historical data was compared to each of the county forecasts. Projections were made when county forecasts were not available. We intend to adjust the assumptions to ensure consistency with the county forecasts as we move forward. Some of the assumptions are that gasoline based revenues will be kept whole even if the impacts of alternative fuels increase in the future. Any revenue source based on an excise tax or sales tax on gasoline is assumed to stay whole even if gasoline consumption per vehicle goes down (e.g. hybrid vehicles, increased transit use). We also assume that the Highway Trust Fund would grow as it has historically. The point was reiterated that the model is flexible and is open to changes in the assumptions. We began with historical data because we felt it to be the most defensible starting point.

Ms. Walecka, Transportation Corridor Agencies asked if a distinction is being made between public dollars and private dollars, more specifically with the toll revenues. Mr. Williges commented that toll revenues, developer, and mitigation fees are all difficult areas to forecast precisely because there are no published sources for either of these areas.

Chair Schuiling asked if guidance was provided by the federal transportation agencies or by other MPO's as to what kind of assumptions are deemed acceptable by the FHWA/FTA. Mr. Hatata stated that a review can be made of a few other RTP's that have been developed recently such as SANDAG's, to assess what they did and how the federal agencies reacted to them since these documents are relatively recent. Another option is to talk with the FHWA and ask for official guidance on what should be done in terms of assumptions for federal funding.

Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr, Orange County COG asked if the TAC would be involved in reviewing and commenting of the revenue model. Ms. Nam, SCAG stated that the model will be provided in both the technical appendix as well as the main RTP document for Transportation Finance which the TAC will be able to review. Specific details/assumptions included in the model are at a preliminary stage currently and TAC will be kept abreast of the developments as we proceed.

4.3 RTP Gap Analysis for 2004 RTP Status Report

Mr. Amatya, SCAG provided members with a brief update on the status of the Gap Analysis. He reported the following:

- Comments from the Fed's and Caltrans have been received.
- Caltrans commented that they concur with SCAG's findings and that the gap analysis addressed what the SAFETEA-LU requires.
- Feds commented on SCAG's public outreach efforts and environmental mitigation requirements.

The gap analysis describes what was done in the 2004 RTP and what is to be accomplished in the full update. Staff's position is that all of the comments that the USDOT submitted have been sufficiently addressed. The final gap analysis has been packaged and includes a resolution by Regional Council to adopt the document as an administrative amendment to the 2004 RTP. A response and comments matrix is also included as an attachment. If you are interested in reviewing those documents, they will be available for viewing at SCAG's website on the 2004 RTP page.

4.4 Standing Items

4.4.1 Growth Forecast / RHNA

Item was postponed until next month's meeting.

Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr, Orange County COG requested to include in next month's agenda a copy of the presentation and staff report.

4.4.2 Highways and Arterials

Mr. Amatya, SCAG provided the committee with a quick recap on the process for the CMIA programming. Currently, the CMIA application was submitted to the CTC and contains an excess of thirty projects for the entire region. SCAG is requesting additional funds than what the CTC has identified in their preliminary recommendations. In addition, some of the eventual CMIA projects are not currently in the 2004 RTP or include scope or scheduling changes requiring that the RTP be amended. Staff has already begun preliminary work on the amendment process.

Mr. Amatya also pointed out that there will be a CTC meeting on February 28th in which a determination will be made as to what projects will be funded. Subsequent to CTC's announcement, staff expects to have a clearer idea of what projects will be funded and what projects will need to be amended in order to move forward. This item will be discussed at next month's TAC meeting.

5.0 Staff Report

5.1 SCAG Committees and Task Forces Summary

Mr. Amatya, SCAG invited committee members to participate in the upcoming workshop focusing on transportation finance on March 1, 2007. It will be held at SCAG's downtown Los Angeles office.

Chair Schuiling briefed committee members on the South Coast Air Quality Management District meeting in which AQMD staff released a draft of the emission budget for the 2024 eight-hour ozone standard against which conformity will be determined for the RTP. The important point is that the nitrogen oxide level was 119 tons, which is minuscule and will be remarkably challenging to get near this level considering the projected freight movement activity. This standard will make the air quality conformity process challenging for the next RTP.

6.0 Adjournment

Chair Ty Schuiling, adjourned the meeting at 12:07pm. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held at SCAG's Los Angeles office on March 15, 2007.